

Michael Tenenbaum, Esq. (No. 186850)
mt@post.harvard.edu
THE OFFICE OF MICHAEL TENENBAUM, ESQ.
1431 Ocean Ave., Ste. 400
Santa Monica, CA 90401
Tel (424) 246-8685
Fax (424) 203-4285

Counsel for Plaintiff International Fur Trade Federation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

INTERNATIONAL FUR TRADE
FEDERATION, an unincorporated association;
Plaintiff,

– against –

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO;
and

DR. GRANT COLFAX, an individual, in his
official capacity as Director of the San
Francisco Department of Public Health;

Defendants,

and

THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED
STATES; and

ANIMAL LEGAL DEFENSE FUND;

Intervenor-Defendants

Case No. 3:20-cv-00242-RS

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER RE IFF'S COMBINED
OPPOSITION TO MOTIONS TO DISMISS**

1 Plaintiff International Fur Trade Federation (“IFF”), Defendants City and County of San
 2 Francisco and Grant Colfax (“Defendants”), and Intervenor-Defendants The Humane Society of the
 3 United States and Animal Legal Defense Fund (“Intervenors”) (collectively, the “Parties”), hereby
 4 stipulate as follows:

5 WHEREAS, on April 24, 2020, the Court entered an order (Dkt. 29) approving the Parties’
 6 stipulation regarding, *inter alia*, the briefing schedule on both Defendants’ and Intervenor’s motions to
 7 dismiss (Dkts. 30 & 33);

8 WHEREAS such briefing schedule contemplated that IFF would file an opposition to
 9 Defendants’ motion to dismiss by May 25, 2020, and a *separate* opposition to Intervenor’s motion to
 10 dismiss by June 1, 2020 (Dkt. 29);

11 WHEREAS, in the interest of avoiding the duplication of effort for the Court (and for itself)
 12 that filing two separate opposition briefs would entail, IFF has elected to file a single brief containing
 13 its combined opposition to both Defendants’ and Intervenor’s motions, which it filed on May 27, 2020
 14 (Dkt. 39) (Tenenbaum Decl. ¶ 2);¹

15 WHEREAS, while IFF was able to combine its opposition to both motions (which motions
 16 were 24 and 15 pages, respectively), and would have been able to take up to 25 pages to oppose each
 17 in separate briefs under Civil L.R. 7-3(a), IFF’s combined opposition is 29 pages, which exceeds the
 18 ordinary page limit for a single brief (*id.* ¶ 3); and

19 WHEREAS the previously stipulated due date for Defendants’ and Intervenor’s reply briefs is
 20 June 18, 2020, which is over a month before the July 23, 2020, hearing on the Parties’ motions, and
 21 the Parties agree to Defendants’ and Intervenor’s request for an additional day for their replies in light
 22 of the foregoing (*id.* ¶ 4);

23 NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties further stipulate and respectfully request that the Court for
 24 good cause enter an order approving their stipulation as follows:

25 1. IFF’s combined opposition (Dkt. 39) to Defendants’ and Intervenor’s motions to

26
 27 ¹ Such filing on May 27, 2020, is five days earlier than the previously stipulated due date as to
 28 Intervenor’s motion but, on account of the additional time IFF required to combine its opposition, two
 days later than the stipulated due date as to Defendants’ motion — as to which neither Defendants nor
 Intervenor objects.

2. Defendants shall have until June 19, 2020, to file their replies.

Dated: May 28, 2020

/s/ Michael Tenenbaum

Michael Tenenbaum, Esq.

mt@post.harvard.edu

THE OFFICE OF MICHAEL TENENBAUM, ESQ.

Counsel for Plaintiff International Fur Trade Federation

Dated: May 28, 2020

/s/Aileen M. McGrath*

Aileen McGrath, Esq.

aileen.mcgrath@sfcityatty.org

DENNIS J. HERRERA, CITY ATTORNEY

Attorneys for Defendants City and County of San Francisco; and Dr. Grant Colfax, an individual, in his official capacity as Director of the San Francisco Department of Public Health

Dated: May 28, 2020

/s/ Bruce A. Wagman*

Bruce A. Wagman, Esq.

BWagman@rshc-law.com

RILEY SAFER HOLMES & CANCELA LLP

*Attorneys for Intervenor-Defendants The Humane Society
of the United States and Animal Legal Defense Fund*

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May , 2020

Hon. Richard Seeborg

United States District Judge

* Pursuant to Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), the filer of this document attests that concurrence in the filing of the document has been obtained from each of the other electronic signatories hereto.